



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,592	08/30/2001	Hisao Tajima	862.C2394	6415

5514 7590 08/26/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

LEE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/941,592	Applicant(s) TAJIMA, HISAO	
	Examiner M. Lee	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/5/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (5,769,374).

Regarding claim 1, Martin discloses an apparatus for mounting a computer peripheral device, such as a video camera (col. 3, lines 36-46), at selectively variable locations on a display monitor showing an image display apparatus 30 which include connecting electrodes (62), peripheral devices (36) which also include connecting electrodes (62), and a guide 32 for forming a path when the mounting positions of the peripheral devices on the image display apparatus are moved. The electrodes in the display monitor and the electrodes in the peripheral devices are placed in contact with their respective electrodes. In other words, the electrical cables 62 connect the display monitor and the peripheral devices together through some electrical connector means.

Regarding claim 2, the groove 32 meets the guide or rail as claimed.

Regarding claim 3, the groove 32 is located at the display monitor 36.

Regarding claim 4, as illustrated in Figure 3, the electrical cables are placed along parallel with the groove 32.

Regarding claim 6, see Figure 1. The screen size of the monitor is intended to be in any size.

Regarding claim 9, see similar reasons as recited above.

Regarding claims 14 and 15, the guide 32 is arranged along the fringe of the display device 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (5,769,374) in view of Mouchi (4,676,567).

Regarding claim 5, Martin does not specify that at least part of the guide also serves as the first electrode as claimed. Mouchi, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches a track mounted fixture which can be used for mounting video cameras (col. 3, lines 31-34). As illustrated in Figure 1, Mouchi shows that electrical conductors or electrodes 23-25 are functioned as guide rail for contact electrode members 8 and 9. Since Mouchi suggests that the track mounted fixture can be used with a video camera and knowing that the video camera in Martin glides on a groove or track similar to that of Mouchi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include Mouchi into Martin so that the dangling and unsightly cables 62 can be avoided.

Art Unit: 2614

5. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (5,769,374).

Regarding claim 7, Martin does not specify the first or second electrode has a spherical shape. In any event, it is well known that electrical connectors or electrodes come with many different shapes. Spherical is just one of them. The selection of the shape of the electrodes would have been considered an obvious design choice.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize spherical shaped electrodes as the electrical connectors in Martin to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 8, the electrodes or electrical connectors are inherently insulated with elastic materials such as plastic.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that Martin et al. is devoid of any disclosure of direct contact between a peripheral device electrode and an image display device electrode made by positioning the peripheral device to any of plural positions along a peripheral device guide on the image display device, the examiner disagrees. In Martin et al., the peripheral device 36 is adaptively connected to the computer monitor via an electrical cable 62 (see col. 4, lines 50-55). In other words, the electrical cable 62 forms a part of the peripheral device and it must have a female or mail plug at the end of the cable in order to make connection to the monitor. Since it is a part of the peripheral

device, the plug at the end of the electrical cable 62 is considered as an electrode, which meets the second electrode as claimed. Similarly, the receptacle at the monitor for receiving the cable plug is also considered as another electrode, which meets the first electrode as claimed. A detail illustration of the cable adapter can be found in Verstockt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,239,841), a reference of record. In Figure 1, Verstockt shows a camera 14 having an electrical cable with a plug-in adapter inserted into a plug-in port of a laptop computer. Since the electrode of the cable plug in Martin et al. is connected directly to the electrode of the receiving plug of the computer monitor, the claimed limitations still met by Martin et al. Accordingly, the rejection still stands.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller, can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



M. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614